



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,928	10/28/2003	Pablo R. Rodriguez	304931.01	7025
22971	7590	12/27/2007		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			EXAMINER SURVILLO, OLEG	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,928

Applicant(s)

RODRIGUEZ, PABLO R.

Examiner

Oleg Survillo

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Action is responsive to the amendment filed on October 19, 2007.

Claims 10-35 are pending in the application. Claims 10, 11, 13, and 21 are amended herein. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-9 have been withdrawn from consideration as a result of an earlier restriction requirement.

Response to Arguments

2. With regard to the Applicant's remarks filed on October 19, 2007:

Regarding drawing objections, the Applicant's amendments have been fully considered and are sufficient. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

Regarding specification objections, the Applicant's amendments have been fully considered and are sufficient. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, applicant's amendments have been considered and are sufficient. As to claim 10, a proper antecedent basis for "the request" has been established by explicitly claiming "the incoming request" and "the outgoing request". As to claim 13, antecedent basis rejection has been resolved. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al., applicant argued that other than the last amended claims were used in the rejection of the Office action mailed on July 20, 2007 resulting in an improper rejection. During the brief conversation with Applicant's Attorney, L. Alan Collins on December 18, 2007, it was confirmed that the most recent set of claims was used, as filed in RCE on May 29, 2007. Therefore, the rejection of the last Office action is deemed proper.

Regarding the rejection of claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al., applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

As to independent claims 10 and 23, Applicant argued that: "the combination of Viswanath and Greer does not disclose the feature of "terminating"" (page 2 of Remarks). Applicant cited relevant portions of the current specification (par. [0006], [0007], and [0037]) and also par. [0041] of Viswanath reference used in the last Office action. Concluding citation from the specification and from Viswanath, applicant argued that: "Viswanath teaches away from terminating the request as claimed by teaching modifying and forwarding the request. Neither does Greer teach, disclose, or suggest such claimed terminating the request." Both of these related arguments are not persuasive for at least the following reasons:

citations from the current specification, such that at par. [0006] and [0007] essentially repeat limitations of independent claims 10 and 23, providing an antecedent basis for "terminating the request", but otherwise failing to provide any definition or

explanation of what "terminating the request" is and what it does, or anyhow distinguishing "terminating the request" of claims 10 and 23 from "terminating the request" of Viswanath. As a result, recited paragraphs [0006] and [0007] do not provide sufficient support for applicant's argument;

citation from the current specification at par. [0037] shows that: "wireless network access device 130 operates as a proxy server, receives requests and provides requested resources from local cache memory, if possible. Otherwise, wireless network access device 130 terminates the received resource request..." Par. [0037] also shows that: "wireless network access device then generates a new resource request and opens separate TCP connections with the destination address over a plurality of the wireless communication interfaces." Once again, recited paragraph [0037] merely mentions "terminating the received request" with reference to Fig. 4, but otherwise failing to provide any definition or explanation of what "terminating the request" is and what it does, or anyhow distinguishing "terminating the request" of claims 10 and 23 from "terminating the request" of Viswanath. As a result, recited paragraph [0037] does not provide sufficient support for applicant's argument.

However, there are several points worth mentioning regarding the recited par. [0037] and corresponding Fig. 4:

(a) at par. [0037] it is shown, with respect to Fig. 4 that: "wireless network access device 130 receives and provides requested resources from local cache memory, if possible. Otherwise, wireless network access device 130 terminates the received resource request..." This is inconsistent with Fig. 4 that clearly shows that request is

terminated prior to determining if requested resource can be provided from local cache memory (see operation 412 and 414, wherein 412 precedes 414). This inconsistency between teaching of par. [0037] and Fig. 4 renders "terminating the received request" ambiguous as it is unclear at which point the request is really being "terminated".

(b) Based on Fig. 4 and teachings from prior art, such as Bai et al. (US 2005/0193131) at par. [0006], it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art what is being meant by "terminating the received request" in case when it is determined that resource can be provided from local cache memory, and subsequently returning cached resource (see operations 414 and 416 in Fig. 4). In this particular case "terminating the request" may be interpreted on its face since the request is, in fact, being terminated – i.e. not transmitted to a destination address (content server).

However, in case when it is determined that resource is not cached, one of ordinary skill in the art would not use the same interpretation for "terminating the request" as used just above because the request is being transmitted to a destination address after being "terminated" (see operation 418). The fact that "terminated" resource request is still being transmitted with the destination address (as specified in the received resource request from a user) over a plurality of the wireless communication interfaces (par. [0037]) shows that the received request was only modified by the wireless network access device 130, and was not terminated as in case when cached resources are being returned, as discussed above.

Since there is no apparent definition of "terminating the received resource request" or explanation of what "terminating the received resource request" is and how

it is different from cited references in the last Office action, and also in addition to the above-mentioned inconsistencies between the specification and figures, applicant's arguments cannot be held as persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. (US 2007/0118670 A1) in view of Greer et al. (US Patent No.: 5,978,828).

As to claim 10, the preamble has been given patentable weight since the claim body refers back to the preamble. See "the virtual resource" at line 1 of the body.

As to claim 10, Viswanath in view of Greer shows a method for retrieving a virtual resource from a remote computer using a plurality of wireless network interfaces (abstract of Viswanath), comprising:

receiving, from a computing device, an incoming request for the virtual resource [receiving a network access request from a serving node] (paragraph [0003] in Viswanath);

terminating the incoming request [not transmitting the incoming request by modifying the received (incoming) request] (step 216 in Fig. 3, par. [0041] in Viswanath);

determining a number of available wireless network interfaces [determining a number of available gateway GPRS support nodes (20)] (paragraph [0021] in Viswanath);

assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface, at least one object in the resource being assigned a different available wireless network interface than another object in the same resource [performing a load balancing of network access requests wherein one or more gateways is determined and one of the gateways is selected for negotiating a request with the network] (paragraph [0003] and [0023] in Viswanath); and

transmitting an outgoing request for the virtual resource, wherein the outgoing request specifies the available wireless network interface assigned to an object [modifying the incoming network access request to include the IP address of selected gateway and forwarding the modified (outgoing) network access request to selected gateway] (paragraph [0041] in Viswanath).

Viswanath does not show that the virtual resource comprises a plurality of objects, determining a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object.

Greer shows that the virtual resource comprises a plurality of objects (Fig. 3 and 4) wherein a virtual resource is interpreted here as comprising a web page which

comprises a plurality of objects. Greer also shows determining a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object [sending a request to a server for information about a web page] (col. 8 lines 30-35) wherein the response message from the server includes the number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object (Figure 6; col. 4 lines 18-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Viswanath by having a virtual resource comprising a plurality of objects and determining a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object in order to easily distinguish between multiple parts of the resource.

As to claim 12, Viswanath shows that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises monitoring one or more characteristics of a wireless network interface [monitoring the existence of gateways by formulating a list (32) of gateways] (paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 14, Viswanath shows that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises monitoring one or more characteristics of a wireless interface stored in a data table in memory [formulating a list of gateways that link to the identified APN] (paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 16, Viswanath in view of Greer shows that determining a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object comprises querying the remote computer (Fig. 10; col. 8 lines 30-35 in Greer).

As to claim 22, Viswanath in view of Greer shows a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions that is capable of performing the method recited in claim 10 (claims 42-49 in Viswanath).

As to claim 23, Viswanath in view of Greer shows:

at least one local communication network interface [serving GPRS Support Node (18)] (Fig. 1 in Viswanath) for receiving a request for a virtual resource, wherein the virtual resource comprises a plurality of objects (as discussed per claim 10);

a plurality of wireless network interfaces [Gateway GPRS support node (20)] (Fig. 1 in Viswanath) for transmitting virtual resource requests over wireless communication connections;

a memory module (104) (Fig. 2 in Viswanath); and

a processor (102) (Fig. 2 in Viswanath) executing logic instructions that configure the processor to perform the method steps of claim 10, as discussed above.

As to claim 25, Viswanath shows that the plurality of wireless network interfaces comprises a first network interface for a first wireless network service provider and a second wireless network interface for a second wireless network service provider [at least gateway (20a) for network (16a) and at least gateway (20c) for network (16b)] (Fig. 1).

As to claim 26, Viswanath shows that the processor polls the wireless network interfaces to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by

the wireless network interfaces [formulating a list (32) of gateways (20) that link to the identified APN] (paragraph [0021]) [and keeping a record of gateways that recently served requests in round-robin approach] (paragraph [0033]).

5. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al. and in further view of Boehm (US 2004/0085944 A1).

As to claim 11, Viswanath shows that receiving the incoming request for the virtual resource comprises receiving the incoming request from a computing device over a radio access network (Fig. 1).

Viswanath in view of Greer does not explicitly show that the incoming request for the virtual resource comprises receiving the incoming request from a computing device over a local communication network.

Boehm shows that the incoming request for the virtual resource comprises receiving the incoming request from a computing device over a local communication network (paragraph [0020], Fig. 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by receiving the incoming request from a computing device over a local communication network in order to receive requests from computing devices locally connected to the portable Wireless Internet gateway (Fig. 3, paragraph [0020] in Boehm).

As to claim 24, Viswanath shows that the at least one local communication network interface comprises a wireless network interface [Serving GPRS Support Node (18)] (Fig. 1) that communicates with mobile devices (12) over a Radio Access Network (24) (Fig. 1).

Alternatively, Boehm shows that the at least one local communication network interface comprises a wireless network interface [a portable gateway (315)] (Fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by having the at least one local communication network interface comprises a wireless network interface in order to enable wireless communication with mobile devices.

6. Claims 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al. and in further view of Nelson (US 2003/0055975 A1).

As to claim 13, Viswanath shows that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises monitoring the existence of gateways by formulating a list of gateways (paragraph [0021]).

Viswanath in view of Greer does not show that a signal characteristic is selected from the group of signal characteristics consisting of: signal-to-noise ratio, available bandwidth, congestion, signal strength, connection cost, and bit error rate.

Nelson shows that a signal characteristic is selected from the group of signal characteristics consisting of: signal-to-noise ratio, available bandwidth, congestion, signal strength, connection cost, and bit error rate (paragraph [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by having a signal characteristic selected from the group of signal characteristics consisting of: signal-to-noise ratio, available bandwidth, congestion, signal strength, connection cost, and bit error rate in order to select a wireless network interface with lowest signal-to-noise ratio, highest available bandwidth, lowest congestion, highest signal strength, lowest connection cost and bit error rate as ones of the old and well known techniques for load balancing (paragraph [0023] in Viswanath).

As to claim 15, Viswanath in view of Greer shows querying local domain name server (30) for a list of available wireless network interfaces.

Viswanath in view of Greer does not show that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises querying the wireless interfaces.

Nelson shows that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises querying the wireless interfaces (paragraph [0083]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by that determining a number of available wireless network interfaces comprises querying the wireless interfaces in order to verify that a selected wireless network interface is currently available to handle the network access request.

7. Claims 17-21, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al. and in further view of Non-Patent Literature reference "Dynamic Parallel Access to Replicated Content in the Internet" by Pablo Rodriguez and Ernst Biersack.

As to claims 17 and 30, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprises assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold.

Rodriguez and Biersack show a method of parallel downloads from a plurality of servers and a parallel access with a scheme where the client opens multiple parallel connections to the same server. In particular, Rodriguez and Biersack show assigning each object to at least one available network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold (page 455 col. 2 lines 5-7, 17-20, 29-30; page 456 col. 1 lines 15-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold in order to utilize two or more available gateways when connecting to a server (paragraph [0021] lines 17-20 in Viswanath).

As to claims 18 and 31, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface

comprises assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the bandwidth of available wireless network interfaces.

Rodriguez and Biersack show assigning each object to at least one available network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the bandwidth of available wireless network interfaces (page 455 col. 2 lines 5-7, 17-20, 29-30; page 456 col. 1 lines 15-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the bandwidth of available wireless network interfaces in order to utilize two or more available gateways when connecting to a server (paragraph [0021] lines 17-20 in Viswanath) such that the portion of a document delivered by one server should be proportional to its service rate, thus, a slow server will deliver a small part of the document while a fast server will deliver a large part of the document (Rodriguez and Biersack, page 455 col. 2 lines 17-20).

As to claims 19 and 32, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprises assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if

the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the size of an object relative to the size of other objects in the virtual resource.

Rodriguez and Biersack show assigning each object to at least one available network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the size of an object relative to the size of other objects in the virtual resource (page 455 col. 2 lines 5-7, 17-20, 29-30; page 456 col. 1 lines 15-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprising assigning an object to two or more available wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold, wherein the threshold is a function of the size of an object relative to the size of other objects in the virtual resource in order to utilize two or more available gateways when connecting to a server (paragraph [0021] lines 17-20 in Viswanath) such that the portion of a document delivered by one server should be proportional to its service rate, thus, a slow server will deliver a small part of the document while a fast server will deliver a large part of the document (Rodriguez and Biersack, page 455 col. 2 lines 17-20).

As to claims 20 and 33, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for receiving objects over the plurality of assigned wireless network interfaces; and collating the received objects to construct the virtual resource.

Rodriguez and Biersack show receiving objects over the plurality of assigned wireless network interfaces; and collating the received objects to construct the virtual resource (page 455 col. 2 lines 7-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by receiving objects over the plurality of assigned wireless network interfaces; and collating the received objects to construct the virtual resource in order to provide the computing device that requested a resource an assembled resource.

As to claim 21, Viswanath shows all the elements except for transmitting the virtual resource to the computing device that originated the incoming request.

Greer shows transmitting the virtual resource to the computing device that originated the incoming request [server sending a response message to the client] (step 704 Fig. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath by transmitting the virtual resource to the computing device that originated the incoming request in order to complete the request-response communication between client and server.

Alternatively, Rodriguez and Biersack show transmitting the virtual resource to the computing device that originated the incoming request (page 455 col. 2 lines 5-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Viswanath in view of Greer by transmitting the virtual

resource to the computing device that originated the incoming request in order to complete the request-response communication between client and server.

As to claim 27, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for the processor polling the wireless network interfaces on a periodic basis to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces.

Rodriguez and Biersack show that the processor polls the wireless network interfaces on a periodic basis to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces (page 455 col. 2 lines 20-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by polling the wireless network interfaces on a periodic basis to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces in order to periodically determine information concerning the server's activities wherein a server contains at least one network interface.

As to claim 28, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for the processor polling the wireless network interfaces in response to a received request to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces.

Rodriguez and Biersack show that the processor polls the wireless network interfaces in response to a received request to determine characteristics of the

communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces (page 455 col. 2 lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by polling the wireless network interfaces in response to a received request to determine characteristics of the communication connections managed by the wireless network interfaces in order to dynamically determine information concerning the server's activities wherein a server contains at least one network interface.

As to claim 29, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for the processor assigning objects to wireless network interfaces according to an algorithm that maximizes bandwidth.

Rodriguez in view of Biersack shows that the processor assigns objects to wireless network interfaces according to an algorithm that maximizes bandwidth (page 455 col. 2 lines 42-48 and page 456 col. 1 lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by having the processor assigning objects to wireless network interfaces according to an algorithm that maximizes bandwidth in order to take advantage of parallel-access technique described by Rodriguez and Biersack.

8. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. in view of Greer et al. and in further view of Holder (US 2003/0208554 A1).

As to claim 34, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for the processor being further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, and to store received virtual resources in the memory module.

Holder shows that the processor is further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, and to store received virtual resources in the memory module (paragraph [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by having the processor being further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, and to store received virtual resources in the memory module in order to enable local caching of requested resources that would reduce latency (paragraph [0024] in Holder).

As to claim 35, Viswanath in view of Greer shows all the elements except for the processor being further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, to store received virtual resources in the memory module, and to transmit received virtual resources over the local communication network interface.

Holder shows that the processor is further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, to store received virtual resources in the memory module (paragraph [0024]), and to transmit received virtual resources over the local communication network interface (paragraph [0004] and [0025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Viswanath in view of Greer by having the processor being further configured to receive requested virtual resources transmitted across a plurality of wireless interfaces, to store received virtual resources in the memory module and to transmit received virtual resources over the local communication network interface in order to enable local caching of requested resources that would reduce latency (paragraph [0024] in Holder) and enable the requesting client to receive response to the request.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oleg Survillo whose telephone number is 571-272-9691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am - 5:00pm; F 7:30am - 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/695,928
Art Unit: 2142

Page 22

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner: Oleg Survillo

Phone: 571-272-9691



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER